

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

				•	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/533,950	05/04/2005	Andre Roget	271326US0PCT	9633	
22850 7590 06/29/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER		
			HAQ, SHAFIQUL		
ALEXANDRI	ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1641		
•				P	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/29/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	·		
·		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/533,950	ROGET ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Shafiqul Haq	1641
eriod fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOTS IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
tatus			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 A	pril 2007.	
· · · · ·		action is non-final.	
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.
ispositi	on of Claims	•	
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 10-22</u> is/are pending in the appearance of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 10-22</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
pplicati	on Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
riority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
ttachment	t(s)		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	
) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/533,950 Page 2

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/13/07 has been entered.

- 2. Applicant's amendments and arguments filed February 12, 2007 is acknowledged and entered.
- 3. Claims 1-6 and 10-22 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livache et al (Biosensors and Bioelectronics 1998) in view of Domb (US 2006/0013850A1) and Guedon et al (Anal Chem. 2000).

Livache et al disclose a method of immobilization of biological material (e.g. DNA, peptides, protein) (lines 14-15, right column of page 629) to a conductive support (e.g biochip) by means of a pyrrole polymer (see abstract and introduction).

The method comprises coupling biomolecules to pyrrole monomer and mixing solutions of pyrrole monomer and biomolecules bearing a pyrrole group (DNA or peptide) to obtain an electropolymerization solution and electropolymerization to obtain a film of copolymer on conductive medium (see sections 2.1. and 2.3. of page 630). The pyrrole copolymerization process allows the preparation of addressed polypyrrole-DNA/protein on blocks of biosensor array (see section 3.; fig.5 and lines 6-9, right column of page 633). Examples of immobilization of proteins (e.g ACTH hormone) and DNA (Fig. 5; Fig.6 and section 3.4.) are also disclosed.

Livache et al. disclose pyrrole peptides/proteins but, however, do not disclose pyrrole monomers coupled to peptides/proteins using activated pyrrole (i.e. pyrrole monomers activated with coupling groups).

Domb (US 2006/0013850 A1) discloses coating of electropolymerized pyrrole polymers to conductive support (paragraphs [0019], [0027]). Domb also discloses that the electropolymerized polymer can have a second monomer bearing a reactive group/ functional group (paragraphs [0032], [0044], [0051] and [0055]) for binding to bioactive agents such as proteins, enzymes, nucleic acids (paragraph [0024], [0182], [0243], [0244]). Domb further discloses that activated pyrrole monomers {(e.g. Nalkyl pyrrole derivatives possessing functional groups such as carboxylic acid and derivatives thereof (e.g. acyl halide, ester), amine, hydroxyl, vinyl, acetylene and thiol} can be used for binding bioactive agents (paragraphs [0209], [0396] and example 1, especially scheme 1, scheme 2 and PPA-NHS). Domb et al. further

Application/Control Number: 10/533,950

Art Unit: 1641

discloses conditions for attachment of bioactive agent such as peptides and proteins to activated pyrrole monomers (paragraph [0396] and [0397]).

Therefore, given the above disclosure the pyrrole monomers can be coupled to proteins efficiently through activated pyrroles (Domb) (i.e. pyrrole having a reactive group), it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to use pyrrole monomer coupled to proteins as taught by Domb in the electropolymerizing mixture of Livache et al. for immobilizing peptides/proteins to conductive support, with a reasonable expectation of success.

As for amount of current and syntyhesis time, Livache et al disclose different thickness (from 2 to 80 nm approximately) which were obtained by applying an amount of current from 10 to 400uC/mm² (section 3.2., 3.4. and Fig. 4) but do not suggest electopolymerization being carried out with a charge of less that 50uC/mm², for a synthesis time of less than 1000ms to obtain a film of copolymer thickness to about 10nm.

Guedon et al in a polypyrrole-based DNA sensor disclose six different thickness of polypyrroly-ODN spots made by performing the synthesis for 250ms to 1000ms leading to 9-14 nm thick films (page 6007, left column, left column, lines 3-12). The film synthesis is very fast taking about 500ms to spot an 11 nm thick film by a 2-V electrochemical pulse (page 6004, lines 30-31 of left column and page 6005, left column, lines 7-8). Goedon also discloses that for optimal hybridization signal, optimal thickness of the spot was found to be close to 11 nm (see abstract; page 6007, lines 1-1-26 of left column and Fig. 6).

Therefore, given the above fact that a film of pyrrole containing copolymer having a thickness close to 11 nm is desirable for optimal hybridization signal (Guedon et al), it would have been <u>prima facie</u> obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to introduce polymer film thickness close to 11nm (i.e 10nm) in the method of Livache et al, with the expectation of enhancing detection signal and to produce a thickness close to nm within 250ms to 1000ms (Goedon) with a electrode of 50um x 50um, an electric current of less that 50uC/mm² is obvious as described above.

As for location of the conductive support to biosensor device and use of the biosensor device for different purposes (claims 17-21), Livache's conductive support is meant to be used as biosensors and the location and use of the conductive support constitute obvious variations in parameters which are routinely modified in the art and which have not been described as critical to the practice of the invention.

6. Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livache et al (Biosensors and Bioelectronics 1998) in view of Domb (US 2006/0013850A1) and Guedon et al (Anal Chem. 2000) as applied to claims 1-3 and 6-9 above, and further in view of Caillat et al (US 6,803,228).

Livache et al in view of Domb and Guedon et al disclose a method of immobilization of proteins to a conductive support (e.g biochip) by means of a pyrrole polymer as describes above, but the references fail to disclose pyrrole functionalized with maleimide for coupling to protein.

Caillat et al disclose pyrrole polymer functionalized with N-hydroxysuccinimide and maleimide for coupling to biomolecules (see 3rd compound from top in column 4 and lines 63-67).

Therefore, given the fact that functionalization of pyrrole with N-hydroxysuccinimide or maleimide is know and common in the art (Caillat et al), it would have been <u>prima facie</u> obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to functionalize pyrrole monomer with maleimide in the method of Livache et al, with the expectation of producing similarly useful conductive support containg polymer of pyrrole coupled with protein.

7. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livache et al (Biosensors and Bioelectronics 1998), Domb, Guedon et al (Anal Chem. 2000) and Caillat et al (US 6,803,228) as applied to claim 4 in the preceding paragraph, and further in view of Bianchi et al (US 2003/0207400 A1).

The above paragraph 6 describe a method of immobilization of biological material (e.g. DNA or peptide) to a conductive support (e.g biochip) by means of a pyrrole polymer and also disclose pyrrole functionalized with succinimide or maleimide for coupling to protein but the references do not disclose the linkers use to functionalize pyrrole with maleimide as claimed in claim 5.

Bianchi et al disclose different linkers (see scheme 15, 20 and 28) to functionize pyrrole with thiol, maleimide or amino groups and the linkers are either the same as or homologs of the linkers of the instant claim 5.

Therefore, given the fact that functionalization of pyrrole with N-hydroxysuccinimide or maleimide is know and common in the art (Caillat et al) and linkers of different chain length can be employed (Banchi et al), it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to functionalize pyrrole monomer with N-hydroxysuccinimide or maleimide using the linker of Banchi et al, in the method of Livache et al, with the expectation of producing similarly useful conductive support containg polymer of pyrrole coupled with protein. Furthermore, the chain length of the linker do not appear to be critical to the practice of the invention as different chain length linkers can be used and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art unless unexpected results are presented for the linkers as disclosed.

8. Claims 1-3 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livache et al (Analytical Biochemistry 1998) in view of Livache et al (Biosensors and Bioelectronics 1998) and Guedon et al (Anal Chem. 2000).

Livache et al (Analytical Biochemistry) disclose a method of immobilization of oligonucleotide (ODN) to a conductive support (e.g DNA chip) electrochemically by means of a pyrrole polymer (see abstract and lines 6-10 of right column of page 188). The method comprises coupling oligonucleotide to pyrrole monomer and mixing solutions of pyrrole monomer and oligonucleotide bearing a pyrrole group to obtain an electropolymerization solution and electrooxidization to obtain a film of copolymer on conductive medium (Lines 6-10 of right column of page 188 and Fig.1 of page 189). The pyrrole copolymerization process allows the preparation of

Application/Control Number: 10/533,950

Art Unit: 1641

addressed ODN-pyrrole on blocks of biosensor array so that different oligonucleotides can be immobilized to different blocks of biochip (see B of Fig.1). Livache et al disclose (Analytical Biochemistry) different thickness of polypyrrole film deposited on the surface (page 192). Synthesis of the film is stopped when the current applied reaches 125, 160, 200, 250 and 375 nC, values which correspond to respectively- for electrodes measuring 50um x 50um – to 50, 64, 80, 100 and 150 uC/mm² and to a thickness of 10, 16, 20 and 30 nm.

Livache et al (Analytical Biochemistry) do not disclose coupling proteins to pyrrole monomer but suggest copolymerization of many biological molecules (which includes DNA, proteins etc) for immobilization by means of pyrrole polymerization (lines 42-44 of left column of page 194). Livache et al (Analytical Biochemistry) do not suggest electopolymerization being carried out with a charge of less that 50uC/mm², for a synthesis time of less than 1000ms to obtain a film of copolymer thickness to about 10nm, although a range of thickness and a range of currents applied are disclosed.

Livache et al (Biosensors and Bioelectronics 1998) as described in above paragraph 11 disclose of immobilization of peptide to a conductive support by means of a pyrrole polymer wherein protein is coupled to pyrrole monomer.

Guedon et al in a polypyrrole-based DNA sensor disclose six different thickness of polypyrroly-ODN spots made by performing the synthesis for 250ms to 1000ms leading to 9-14 nm thick films (page 6007, left column, left column, lines 3-12). The film synthesis is very fast taking about 500ms to spot an 11 nm thick film by a 2-V

electrochemical pulse (page 6004, lines 30-31 of left column and page 6005, left column, lines 7-8). Goedon also discloses that for optimal hybridization signal, optimal thickness of the spot was found to be close to 11 nm (see abstract; page 6007, lines 1-1-26 of left column and Fig. 6).

Therefore, given the above fact that a film of pyrrole containing copolymer having a thickness close to 11 nm is desirable for optimal hybridization signal (Guedon et al), it would have been <u>prima facie</u> obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to include proteins for immobilization as taught by Livache et al (Biosensors and Bioelectronics 1998) and introduce polymer film thickness close to 11nm (i.e 10nm) (as suggested by Guedon et al) in the method of Livache et al (Analytical Biochemistry), with the expectation of enhancing detection signal and to produce a thickness close to 11nm (i.e. 10nm) within 250ms to 1000ms (Goedon) with a electrode of 50um x 50um, an electric current of less that 50uC/mm² is obvious as described above.

As for, coupling of pyrrole monomers to proteins, Livache et al. disclose pyrrole peptides/proteins but, however, do not disclose pyrrole monomers coupled to peptides/proteins using activated pyrrole (i.e. pyrrole monomers activated with coupling groups).

Domb (US 2006/0013850 A1) discloses coating of electropolymerized pyrrole polymers to conductive support (paragraphs [0019], [0027]). Domb also discloses that the electropolymerized polymer can have a second monomer bearing a reactive group/ functional group (paragraphs [0032], [0044], [0051] and [0055]) for binding to

bioactive agents such as proteins, enzymes, nucleic acids (paragraph [0024], [0182], [0243], [0244]). Domb further discloses that activated pyrrole monomers {(e.g. N-alkyl pyrrole derivatives possessing functional groups such as carboxylic acid and derivatives thereof (e.g. acyl halide, ester), amine, hydroxyl, vinyl, acetylene and thiol} can be used for binding bioactive agents (paragraphs [0209], [0396] and example 1, especially scheme 1, scheme 2 and PPA-NHS). Domb et al. further discloses conditions for attachment of bioactive agent such as peptides and proteins to activated pyrrole monomers (paragraph [0396] and [0397]).

Page 10

Therefore, given the above disclosure the pyrrole monomers can be coupled to proteins efficiently through activated pyrroles (Domb) (i.e. pyrrole having a reactive group), it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to use pyrrole monomer coupled to proteins as taught by Domb in the electropolymerizing mixture of Livache et al. for immobilizing peptides/proteins to conductive support, with a reasonable expectation of success.

As for location of the conductive support to biosensor device and use of the biosensor device for different purposes (claims 17-21), Livache's conductive support is meant to be used as biosensors and the location and use of the conductive support constitute obvious variations in parameters which are routinely modified in the art and which have not been described as critical to the practice of the invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/533,950 Page 11

Art Unit: 1641

Response to Applicant's argument

9. Applicant's arguments filed 2/12/07 have been fully considered but are moot in view

of new grounds of rejections presented in this office action necessitated by

Applicants' amendments.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shafiqul Haq whose telephone number is 571-272-

6103. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Long V. Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Light Har -

SHAFIQUL HAQ

ART UNIT 1641

LONG V. LE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

ART UNIT 1641